DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 314 855 EA 021 556

TITLE A School Is a Workplace: The Report of the ICC Colloquium on Working in the Schools (New York, New York, December 9, 1988). New Perspectives #1.
INSTITUTION New York State Industrial Cooperation Council, New York.
PUB DATE Aug 89
NOTE 37p.
AVAILABLE FROM Publication Sales, New York State Industrial Cooperation Council, 1515 Broadway, 52nd Floor, New York, NY 10036 ($8.00).
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Accountability; Case Studies; Change Strategies; *Educational Change; *Educational Environment; Educational Quality; Elementary Secondary Education; Instructional Effectiveness; *School Effectiveness; *School Organization; *Teacher Role
IDENTIFIERS *Educational Restructuring

ABSTRACT

A colloquium on educational reform held in New York brought together leading educators, union representatives, business leaders, and public officials to discuss one of the greatest challenges to the state and the nation: improving America's public schools. As a follow-up to the discussion, this report documents the most pressing reform issues. The need for reform is discussed in the first section in terms of creating a school environment that is an effective workplace. First, barriers to effective school workplaces are discussed; these exist in the form of lack of respect and status for the teacher "worker"; questions of teacher empowerment and administrator fears; teacher isolation; and poor quality of school structure and organization. The second section deals with four problems with the reform agenda: confusing reform terminology; teacher pressures; lack of workable measures of accountability; and the failure of the Comprehensive School Improvement Program. Agreeing on the goals of reform is the focus of the third section, while agreeing on the means for effective reform is taken up in section 4; such means include increasing discussion between labor and management; adoption of new models; industry cooperation; and accountability measures that work. The last section offers proposals for further consideration in the following areas: (1) participatory decision-making; (2) regulation and accountability; (3) research and development; (4) collective bargaining; and (5) administrator/teacher preparation. Six case studies and a list of colloquium participants are appended. (SI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED314855

A SCHOOL IS A WORKPLACE

The Report of the ICC Colloquium on Working in the Schools

New York State Industrial Cooperation Council

Mario M. Cuomo, Governor

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Lee Smith

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 021 556

NEW PERSPECTIVES #1

DEDICATION

THIS REPORT IS DEDICATED TO THE LATE DR. RICHARD GREEN, WHOSE UNTIMELY DEATH IN EARLY 1989 DEPRIVED THE NATION'S EDUCATION COMMUNITY OF ONE OF ITS BRIGHTEST GUIDING LIGHTS. IN HIS 14 MONTHS AS CHANCELLOR OF THE NEW YORK CITY SCHOOLS, RICHARD GREEN'S LEADERSHIP AND IDEALS INSPIRED ALL WHOSE LIVES HE TOUCHED: CHILDREN, PARENTS, TEACHERS, ADMINISTRATORS, GOVERNMENT AND CIVIC LEADERS AND THE PEOPLE OF THE CITY. HE BROUGHT A SENSE OF HOPE FOR THE FUTURE. HIS ENERGY, WISDOM, COMPASSION, AND INTEGRITY WILL BE MISSED AND SHOULD BE A MODEL FOR ALL. HE CAN HAVE NO GREATER MEMORIAL THAN OUR COOPERATION TO ASSURE QUALITY EDUCATION FOR THE CHILDREN OF NEW YORK TO WHOM HE WAS DEVOTED.

A SCHOOL IS A WORKPLACE

The Report of the ICC Colloquium on Working In The Schools

CONTENTS

PREFACE and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS *ii*

INTRODUCTION 1

I. THE NEED FOR REFORM 1

- Effective Workplaces
- Barriers to Effective School Workplaces
  - Teachers in the School Workplace
  - Teacher Empowerment and Administrators' Fears
  - Teacher Isolation
  - School Structure and Organization

II. PROBLEMS WITH THE REFORM AGENDA 6

- Confusing Reform Terminology
- Pressures on Teachers
- Accountability
- The Failure of CSIP

III. AGREEING ON THE GOALS 9

IV. AGREEING ON MEANS FOR EFFECTIVE REFORM 10

- Increasing Discussion
- New Models for Reform
- Can Industrial Models Apply in School Settings?
- Business/Industry Contributions
- Accountability

V. PROPOSALS FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION 17

- Participatory Decision-making
- Regulation and Accountability
- Research and Development
- Collective Bargaining
- Administrator/Teacher Preparation

CONCLUSION 20

NOTES 21

APPENDIX: CASE STUDIES 23

COLLOQUIUM PARTICIPANTS 29

PREFACE and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

On Friday, December 9, 1988, the Industrial Cooperation Council (ICC) sponsored a Colloquium on education reform. The Colloquium brought together leading educators, union representatives, business leaders and public officals to discuss one of the greatest challenges to the state and the nation: improving our public schools. A report entitled "Working in the Schools," specially commissioned by the ICC and drafted by Hofstra University Associate Dean of Education Terry Baker, served as the meeting's focal point. Morgan Guaranty Co. hosted the three-hour roundtable discussion at its Wall Street offices.

The discussion was chaired by Lewis B. Kaden, Chairman of the ICC. Opening remarks were delivered by Stanley Litow, Executive Director of Interface and Vincent Tese, New York State Director of Economic Development.

The discussion concentrated on three principal issues, outlined by Chairman Kaden at the outset of the colloquium:

1. The labor-management relationship: How do experiments in private-sector labor-management relationships, particularly involving increased employee participation, influence the agenda for education reform?

2. Government's Role: What is the responsibility of State government for education reform as defined by the Legislature? How does this responsibilty apply to cities and municipalities?

3. Accountability: How do we measure success in the schools? How does this relate to labor-management relations and government's role?

In responding to these principal themes, participants focused on the need to increase shared decision-making among teachers and administrators, the incorporation of change at the school building level through a "bottom-up" approach, and the need to establish more effective strategies for accountability within the schools.

As a follow-up to the December 9th discussion, the ICC has produced this report blending statements made at the Colloquium with the main points of Dr. Baker's paper. The report attempts to document the most pressing reform issues as expressed by leaders in the education field within New York State. Like the Colloquium, this report is designed to increase dialogue among the major educational constituencies and to focus attention on some of the crucial challenges facing the public school system. The proposals that conclude the report, while not reflective of a consensus of the Colloquium participants, are starting points for further discussion.

I want to thank the many members of the ICC staff that contributed to the Colloquium and this Report, including Elizabeth Engberg, Gigi Georges, Allen Roskoff, Paul Winston, Jan Stackhouse, and Amy Husten. Working from Terry Baker's paper, Gigi Georges devoted many hours to preparing the draft of this Report. Ira Goldman and Steven Vitoff did the final editing and production of the Report. I especially thank Morgan Guaranty Co. , notably Lewis Preston and Hildy Simmons, for its support of this effort. Finally, Stan Litow was particularly helpful in shaping the Report and making the Colloquium a success.

Lee Smith
Executive Director
Industrial Cooperation Council
August 1989

INTRODUCTION

We live in a nation in which 25 million Americans are unable to read and one-quarter of our public school students fail to complete their high school education. Drugs plague our schools; violence threatens our children; and too often mediocrity is accepted as excellence. But we can do better than this.

The renewal of our public schools requires a commitment to unprecedented initiative and action. In the words of the late New York City Schools Chancellor Dr. Richard Green, "If we fail to seize the moment, I don't think all the studies in the world are going to change our public schools."

Effectively "seizing the moment" requires a careful regard for the areas of education that most need reform, and a consensus among teachers, administrators and parents on the school system's goals. If these two points are properly addressed, some agreement can be reached on how to create effective change.

I. THE NEED FOR REFORM

The questions that propel discussion of educational reform grow largely out of national frustration with the often reported failure of our schools to graduate competent citizens. Some have sought to salve that frustration with assessments and condemnations of the various curricula; others have questioned the quality of our students. Still others have blamed organizational structures or legal and fiscal restraints. For the most part, these assessments are compartmentalized, fragmented, or isolated views of specific phenomena. The questions we are asking, however, do not seek fragmented, specialized, or isolated answers. Rather, we seek complete and thorough solutions in an attempt to overcome the tremendous obstacles within our school system. As New York State Education Commissioner Thomas Sobol urges, "When you look for the answer, my hope is that you will look for answers — plural — across a range of activities ... rather than for some magic answer."

Effective Workplaces

"Our schools are still modeled along the old factory model. There is supervision rather than collegiality... The system is outdated, and it stifles creativity..."

Sandra Feldman
President, UFT

The urgency of Dr. Green's challenge rings true across the state and the nation. Yet it is the view of the writers of this report that Dr. Green's plea cannot be met until we learn how to make our schools effective workplaces.

What constitutes an effective or good school workplace?

What is its relationship to good education for children? Do the lessons of effective workplaces learned in private enterprise transfer to public school settings? These are some of the questions that provoked this report. They are questions that appear frequently in the more popular educational press, and they are questions that task forces, commissions, special panels, and research groups are tackling with vigor. They have become among the more popular issues discussed at professional conferences and written about in dissertations. Even the Holmes Group has taken to advocating "more knowledge about teaching as work and about schools as work settings" as crucial for raising the status of teaching. [1] Yet the discussion has taken little shape, and the results, so far, are unimpressive.

Among those who have tried to find, define, and describe "good" workplaces in industry and the corporate world, value words are used more often than concrete descriptors. Some describe a good workplace simply as a setting that employees "feel good about," while others equate good workplaces with productivity.

Robert Levering defines a good workplace as one with distinctive corporate practices that set the company apart from others and give it a special character. [2] Workers want to take "pride" in their company and their work. They value "trust", "being treated fairly," being "allowed to make mistakes," "friendliness," and a sense of "family." The values listed above are somewhat abstract, yet Levering contends that employees' concerns with such issues do not detract from productivity or hard work. After identifying the workplaces that employees felt best about, Levering studied the productivity indicators for his 100 best U.S. workplace companies and compared his results against similar data for the firms comprising the Standard & Poor 500. He found that his companies outperformed the S&P group two to one on growth in profits over time and three to one in increase in the price of stock. Levering also cites similar studies, one of which found that industrial firms that use "participative-management techniques outperformed others on financial strength, earnings per share, average annual earnings yield and net profit."

Levering concludes that "great workplaces may offer a slightly different approach to productivity. They implicitly say that people tend to work more cooperatively when they are treated with respect, are given a say in what they do and are given what they consider a fair share of the rewards for their efforts." Just what the specifics of a "great workplace" mean to each employee or set of employees varies tremendously across the span of corporate America. Clearly, there are no universal organizational or management plans that insure good workplaces everywhere. While some employees enjoy working in a rigidly structured, authoritarian setting, others prefer a free-flowing, competitive, entrepreneurial setting. Still others seek a supportive, caring, safe

workplace with paternalistic management.

According to Levering, management which seeks to create an effective workplace should consider local issues, values and goals when creating policies and practices. If trust among workers and management is to be maintained, decisions must be made as close to the individual workplace as possible.

Barriers to Effective Workplaces

Teachers in the School Workplace

Whether or not teachers are recognized as "professionals," they take on the role of "workers" in the old factory model of schooling. School administrators, by function, are also "workers," but are not perceived as such. As "workers," teachers lack status and are excluded from much of the school's professional life.

Deborah Meier described the educational changes wrought under Frank Macchiarola's Chancellorship of the New York City schools in these terms: "Teachers were the workers...and students the products. Our products should roll off our assembly line classroom in uniformly proper condition—with plenty of inspections along the way." [3]

The lack of trust and respect accorded teachers and their working conditions results in poor treatment of students. [4] Not all would subscribe to this backlash theory, but most would agree that disrespect for teachers obstructs students' education. John Dewey, in an early response to the application of scientific expertise to the schools, indicated that if teachers are denied access to "their own intellectual and spiritual individuality, they can only follow the prescriptions of outside experts in a mechanical, capricious manner. The prevalence of external dictation only perpetuates conditions of inefficiency; lack of interest; and inability to assume self direction; and works to retain incompetents because the best minds will not submit to conditions which no self-respecting intelligence likes to put up with." [5]

Teacher Empowerment and Administrators' Fears

The earliest discussions of "teacher empowerment" raised red flags among administrators, and recent shifts to terms such as "restructuring" have not fully assuaged their anxiety or objections.

Behind these terms, administrators — and especially their professional organizations — fear that principals will be removed completely from the schools. Some see the issue as a power struggle between the two major school labor groups, with the

"If you go around and talk to administrators these days you'll find that everyone is in favor of teacher involvement. But the difficulty is that the administrators do not want to lose any of the power or authority. Or even more so, their middle management staff is very concerned about what is happening and they don't want to betray them. So they see no way to proceed and achieve both, to have teachers involved and be able to support the management."

Thomas Hobart
President, NYSUT

"I will show you 60,000 teachers out of 80,000 who have never seen another teacher teach ... or participated in a real professional exchange with colleagues. Teachers are enormously isolated. ...I'm talking about an ongoing systemic sharing of knowledge that most other professions engage in that teachers can't because they are deliberately isolated by the way that the system is organized and are tethered, in a sense, to their own classrooms. ...Instead of people wanting to help each other learn and share, they are in competition with each other, and those who are doing good things would just as soon hide them because they're afraid that what they are doing will be stopped. "

Sandra Feldman

teachers' organizations carrying the advantage of numbers and access to public policy channels. Interviews with practicing teachers, observations of pilot teacher empowerment projects, and discussions with teacher union executives, however, document that many teachers do not want responsibility for all the administrative actions in their schools. What they want, according to Gene Maeroff, is dignity. "They want their needs and opinions reflected in the policies of the school and of the district; they want influence." [6]

The Council of School Administrators challenged the Carnegie Report's recommendations for such alternative governing arrangements as "lead teachers" and "committees of teachers with one acting as a managing partner in a professional partnership." Administrators see these and other reform suggestions as attempts to shift authority in the schools into the hands of teachers and relegate principals to "the distribution of school supplies and looking after the building." [7]

The collective leadership of administrators tends to speak for centralized authority, both by right of law and pedagogical integrity. Its voice is well in tune with that of former Secretary of Education William Bennett's argument that only school principals should accept the responsibility of authority, and that those who question such an allocation of power should seek other employment.

Some administrators, such as Robert Owens, who has served both as a research scholar and school principal, take an opposite tack. For years, Owens has written that effective schools are characterized by a culture of collaboration in which teachers and administrators create a collegial atmosphere.

In New York State, Commissioner Sobol believes that the conflict between administrators and teachers is "very real," but downplays the sense of antagonism that others see within teacher-administrator relations. "I have heard no school board member and no administrator argue that teachers shouldn't be involved.... On the other hand I have heard no teacher argue that it is time for school boards and school administrators to stand aside and let teachers take over," he says, adding that "there seems to be a general consensus that something needs to be done to insure that teachers aren't left out ...[and that] they are involved."

Teacher Isolation

There is widespread potential for conflict between individual workers and managers because in many schools teachers operate in isolation from their colleagues and work with managers who are isolated from their superiors. It is therefore not surprising that education lags behind many industries in the move to collaborative and participative styles of contract negotiations.

In 1988, then Secretary of Labor Ann McLaughlin criticized the "combative nature of labor-management relations within the nation's schools...The last area of really adversarial relations between labor and management is within our school system." [8] Not everyone would agree with Secretary McLaughlin's assessment of the tenor of industrial labor relations, but school labor relations do sometimes become shrill, with much of the hostility reserved for struggles between the teachers' and supervisors' organizations.

Although principals seldom become involved in district-level labor negotiations, they are often the focal point of teacher union complaints about unprofessional treatment in schools. Teachers in Queens recently alleged that one school principal called their homes or doctors when they are absent, scolded them publicly and loudly in the hall and over the school loudspeaker, prevented them from talking to each other in the hallways, denied them the right to a social committee, arbitrarily refused personal business days, behaved vindictively toward teachers who file grievances, and refused to deal with the UFT chapter's consultation committee. These are the types of situations that teachers see as contributing to poor workplace morale.

School Structure and Organization

The quality of the school workplace has been sharply questioned, both in terms of organization and physical structure. Arthur Wirth writes, "It isn't our psyches that need massaging. The source of our troubles is in the structure of the schools and its effects on our working relations with each other, with administration, with the kids, and with learning." [9]

The effects that schools have on student performance, according to a study by John Chubb and Terry Moe, are more likely to depend on school environment and on students' relationships with parents and administrative superiors outside the school than on particular educational practices, technology, or philosophies. "Goals, leadership followership, and climate" are the critical elements that surface in their analysis. [10] These components, joined in a collaborative team organization, prove to be the factors most clearly linked to student achievement, yet are the ones least addressed by reform mandates.

And perhaps the most basic pre-condition for reform is a safe, clean physical plant. When school workers cannot count on the system to provide working radiators, unbroken windows, and secure buildings, the higher level workplace issues cannot even be raised.

II. PROBLEMS WITH THE REFORM AGENDA

Learning is a complicated, poorly understood, and difficult process. The impact of teaching on individual children is not easy to predict or measure, nor does legal responsibility carry with it access to either resources or unfettered authority. Between the classroom and the public lies a powerful, massive, and entrenched bureaucracy. All of these factors and more work against open, trusting discussion both among school people and between them and members of the public.

Confusing Reform Terminology

A quick look at the constantly changing reform terminology reveals the first signs of a flawed agenda. We've already gone from "teacher empowerment" through "participatory decision-making" to "restructuring." Lynn Olson quotes Michael Kirst's complaint that "restructuring is a word that means everything and nothing simultaneously...it's all in the eye of the beholder." [11]

The literature on collaborative planning, participatory decision-making, teacher empowerment, human resource techniques, or quality of work life methodology is equally plagued by imprecision. For example, David Nadler and Edward Lawler offer five or six possible definitions of "Quality of Work Life." [12] Clearly, conversations and planning mean little when there is virtually no consensus about definitions. Kirst also asserted that having so many separate items on the agenda merely compounds the sense of conceptual confusion: "There is too much on the plate...It's like trying to eat everything on a Chinese menu." [13]

In truth, each of these terms conveys specific notions about curriculum development, teacher selection and recruitment, hierarchical structures within organizations, collective bargaining, legal prerogatives and responsibilities, textbook selection, parental involvement, measurement methodology, psychological well-being, political power — the whole spectrum of organizational design and operation. The overhauls recommended in various school reform documents and attempted in different industrial settings are nothing short of revolutionary. Yet while many are calling for a revolution, few can describe it.

"There have been many reforms that have been brought into the schools, well-meaning reforms by well-meaning people in the administration and on the school boards. Because political people change, the reform changes. Teachers put in their time and effort and they're told that [the reform] is not going to go any further because of budgetary restraints or something else.... So after a while, teachers who are using their creativity say, 'Well, that's the end of creativity. I'm going to close my door and whatever is given to me I'm going to work with, and it's somebody else's fault. It's not my fault.'"

Thomas Hobart

Pressures on Teachers

The reform agenda has placed burdens on teachers in a number of ways. Teachers are asked to perform newly mandated, even legislated, instructional activities without the provision of

new resources or additional time in the schedule. They are asked, or are asking, to participate in administrative policy work for which they have not been adequately prepared. Furthermore, teachers are asked to provide instruction that follows curricula developed by "specialists" in state education departments rather than take a hand in shaping instruction tailored for their schools or classrooms.

The new pressures on teachers are often accompanied by higher salaries, but research suggests that salaries are not the only or even the highest priority for most teachers. Rather, involvement in implementing new instructional and structural changes is far more responsible for improved teacher motivation and effectiveness.

Acccuntability

At their root, accountability issues derive from society's right and need to know how — and how effectively — its resources are being used. Current debates about accountability do not challenge this basic premise but they do question the programmatic and political agendas that shape the laws and the methods.

Under the Reagan administration, deregulation resulted in a shift of regulatory power from Washington to the state departments of education. The shift was intended to move the authority and responsibility closer to the client, or the local school, and to reduce the amount of regulation. The result has not been quite as expected.

In New York State, for example, accountability measures under the Regents Action Plan have not been effective. Edmund J. McMahon, Jr. points out that the Regents Action Plan requires "every school district in the state to file a Comprehensive Assessment Report containing test scores and information on other indicators such as dropout rates, enrollment and class size."[14] While Commissioner Sobol has praise for the overall accomplishments of the Regents Action Plan, he expresses concern about the workability of the Plan's accountability measures and procedures in the midst of changing school practices and programs. "We must change the status quo of our educational system, and to the extent that we have fundamental change in mind, the Plan's accountability systems do not work," Sobol states. "Instead of our current approach, which is heavily regulated and imposed from above," Sobol adds, "what is needed is an approach which enlists the aid of local practitioners to create new school structures and programs more suited for contemporary conditions." He argues for a "bottom-up approach" to accountabilty that strives for high academic standards.

"The current system of accountability ...does not take abnormal circumstances into account. We have alternative schools here in New York City that have delivered ... challenges to some of the most difficult kids ... but they show up in the bottom ten percent and we call them one of the worst schools. ... That's the reward they get for trying."

Thomas Sobol
New York State
Commissioner of Education

Under current systems of accountability, the most intrinsic goals appear insurmountable. Simply counting instructional outputs remains a serious challenge. We can count material inputs fairly accurately: for example, we can observe teacher and student behavior with some precision. But we do not know how to count what goes on inside their heads. The best we can do is make statistical approximations of relationships and hope that our attributions of causes are close.

The seemingly deathless reliance on standardized tests and single measure or single discipline approaches to evaluation and measurement are almost universally condemned, but change costs, and the costs have not been met. The rise of alternative methodological approaches in recent years — from qualitative methods of assessment to new multi-level quantitative methods for analyzing diverse sets of data — have wrought few answers in the search for thorough measures of accountability.

The Flaws of CSIP

Across the nation, one consistently repeated complaint has been that the only solution that has been offered for individual school or district failure has been to tighten the regulatory screws — to put a "squeeze" on teachers and administrators and, ultimately, on the students. It is a complaint that applies well to the Comprehensive School Improvement Program (CSIP) in New York State. CSIP requires schools that are below the standard of achievement to engage in collaborative decision-making at the school level. But both Sandra Feldman and Commissioner Sobol agree that CSIP, as currently conducted, "does not work."

In pointing to the program's failure, Feldman asserts that "the unions don't have a sense of ownership in it. There is no mandate for union involvement." Commissioner Sobol identifies CSIP's failure by describing significant flaws in the system's structure. "The first," he notes, "is that the goals we have identified and the measures used offer a threadbare vision of what education is all about. The Comprehensive System reports use as their chief measures the PEP tests in reading and mathematics, some attendance data, and dropout rates." While such measures are important, "that's not all that education is about. ... They don't measure a good reading program; they don't measure a good mathematics program. ... And not only do they not measure a good ... program for kids who are more able, they don't measure a good program for kids who are struggling. They're too limited."

Commissoner Sobol identifies a second problem in CSIP's preoccupation "with the attainment of...achievement, not only among the more able kids in the state, but ... also for the kids who have trouble meeting the minimum standards." He

"We just remediate the hell out of kids and beat the life out of them, without giving them the chance to find out what they can do."

Thomas Sobol

observes, "Every day in classroom after classroom, [students] are given large doses of stuff they can't do very well ... and they learn that they aren't good at [it]. ... Meanwhile, all of the possibilities of engaging with them to find out what they are capable of doing and what they are interested in go unchallenged and unstimulated."

III. AGREEING ON THE GOALS

Above the various prescriptions for reform looms the purpose of schooling: to better educate students. Thomas Hobart insists, "We have said that too few students learn well. And that is really the issue."

Schools must be filled with teachers and administrators who have the ability, the resources and the desire to educate, and with parents and outsiders who are concerned enough to get involved. Jewell Jackson McCabe, Chair of the New York State Job Training Partnership Council, asserts that "public schools have got to become living institutions in their communities."

Thomas Corcoran and his colleagues reviewed workplace reform literature and effective schools research and identified ten aspects of "the desired environments for professional work":

* Decent and safe physical conditions;
* Access to the materials and equipment needed;
* Reasonable workloads and time for professional responsibilities;
* Sufficient autonomy to meet study needs;
* Active participation in decisions affecting their work;
* Regular opportunities for interaction and sharing with colleagues;
* Treatment as professionals by superiors and by peers;
* Opportunities for professional growth;
* Meaningful recognition/rewards for their efforts and achievements;
* Supportive leadership.[15]

It is reasonable to assume that everyone involved in education can agree on these points, but discussion must focus on how to achieve them. Moreover, as Sandra Feldman asserts, discussion can hardly take place in a "system that is in constant crisis."

"This is the way I see the future of New York City: ...ultimately I hope to see decision-making at the building level where people are accountable. ... We need some accountability for the children."

Richard Green
Chancellor
New York City Schools

IV. AGREEING ON MEANS FOR EFFECTIVE REFORM

In recent years, several urban centers have worked both to create new labor agreements and to establish new negotiating patterns and processes. Rochester, New York; Hammond, Indiana; Dade County, Florida; Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; Cincinnati, Ohio; and Boston, Massachusetts have led the way and established models.

Although it is not yet clear what the long-term effect of these new processes will be, such changes have broadened the scope of negotiation to the extent that policy issues previously reserved for boards of education have become part of the labor agreement. By opening the process and moving beyond those areas in which formal negotiations have proven effective (such as the division of resources and the creation of work rules), labor has placed on the table such issues as instructional practice, about which teachers have, by default, had considerable discretion.

Increasing Discussion

In New York State, there is a growing consensus for the need to join forces and seek new school-based options for reform. Dr. Green declared that the "the leadership of the employee groups are going to have to come to the table and say, 'It's not going to be top-down.' ... We've got to come to a collective decision about how we're going to share responsibility and in turn share the decision-making all throughout the organization." Thomas Gillett, vice-president and chief negotiator of the Rochester Teacher Association (RTA) cautions, "If the leadership of the opposing sides is not committed to the reform agenda, it is unlikely that any conditions will lead to improving instruction in the schools."

Sandra Feldman stresses that collective bargaining conducted "in a crisis with a deadline" is of little value. Rather, labor and management in New York should take their cue from "what they're doing in Rochester, Dade...and Pittsburgh: an ongoing, almost daily, constant discussion of those issues that will ultimately get put into contractual arrangements which require the system to change itself after a consensus has been reached on those changes."

Citing reforms in other cities as models for shared decision-making, Feldman warns that "there is going to have to be a certain amount of mandating of freedom" in order for these practices to be effective. [Reform] will not happen "naturally" according to Feldman, because "management is afraid of making changes."

Indeed, many traditional assumptions about management and employee roles limit the potential for open and progressive relations. Among such assumptions are: that the power vested in managers, ipso facto, will always be abused; that managers are an elite group of specially qualified persons who are capable of making decisions; that workers are individuals whose personal interests dominate their thinking and render them incapable of considering larger issues; that the extra time and effort required for management activities are contributions that workers are unwilling to make — even for added incentives; and finally, that workers always prefer to work without the benefit of management, controls or leadership. None of these assumptions holds in effective workplaces, but they continue to hold considerable currency in management circles.

By pointing to work done through his organization, District Council 37 (AFSCME) Executive Director Stanley Hill demonstrates that these traditional assumptions can be overcome. "In this city," he notes, "we have 12 to 15 agencies involved in the kind of agenda we have been talking about ... and the success factor is whether management and labor have the mutual respect for each other to make it work."

Charles Hughes speaks for the New York City Board of Education Employees when he looks optimistically toward a future marked by more constructive labor-management relations. Hughes, President of AFSCME Local 372, asserts that "this union certainly stands ready to be part of whatever decision-making process, part of whatever restructuring is going to take place in the city and in the state, and we believe that all of us should work together, and that management ought not be afraid of me and I ought not be afraid of management... ."

State School Boards Association Executive Secretary Louis Grumet approaches the reform agenda somewhat more cautiously. Speaking for his consituency, he asserts that "the school boards need all kinds of preparation and training to become more effective in creating circumstances, or not being intimidated by circumstances, when shared decision-making occurs, whether inside or outside a collective bargaining process."

"I don't know if a labor management model — shared decision-making, teacher empowerment, professional decision-making, whatever the title — will work, but I think it deserves a chance. It doesn't get a chance unless some group in the state makes a push and says that this is the right thing to do."

Thomas Hobart

New Models for Reform

John Chubb and Terry Moe's 1988 report on American high schools reveals the power that effective school-based organization can have on student perfomance. Their study is a multi-level and cross-indexed analysis of several variables that supplements the High School and Beyond study of 25,000 students in 1,000 public and private high schools with a survey of principals and teachers in 500 of the schools.

The surveys revealed that the best schools have different and clearer goals than low-performance schools, staffs that agree on priorities, leadership that is more pedagogical and less managerial, and principals who are viewed as forceful by the teachers. "Decision-making is significantly more democratic" with more authority delegated to the classroom. When held against student performance, school organization indicators prove far more important than indicators of material resources. Student aptitude, school organization, and parental influence are the top three factors related to student achievement. Chubb and Moe conclude, "All other things being equal, attending an effectively organized high school for four years is worth at least a full year of additional achievement over attendance at an ineffectively organized school." [16]

Still, there is no such thing as a formula for effective organization in the schools — indeed, there are countless ways to approach the topic of reform. Existing models, however, can provide valuable insight, and should be monitored and studied.

As Sandra Feldman notes, "The experiments taking place in Dade County and Rochester ... are extremely important.... The key is the ability of teachers to use their expertise in a way that is best for the kids." She stresses the value of "taking a good hard look at what is happening in places like Dade, Rochester and even New York City." In New York, for example, Feldman describes a team-teaching arrangement in which "they've performed miracles. You'd be astonished — in a very ordinary neighborhood high school — to see the understanding that has developed...."

Thomas Gillett describes the Rochester program as a situation in which "management and the union converse daily on problems that come up" and where a structure has been developed "in which parents, teachers, administrators and others, including paraprofessionals and civil service staff at the school level, deal with site-based decision-making." But Gillett warns against being content with limited gains, noting, "With all that in place, Rochester isn't fixed yet. We still have a long way to go."

Commissioner Sobol is optimistic that sweeping changes in the school system are possible. "I think we have to develop entirely new models of schools. We are trying to do this in a variety of ways, for example with ... schools that are open all day, all week [where] we provide a wide range of social and recreational services. ... And we can do a great deal more to deal effectively and affirmatively with the ethnic and cultural diversity of society."

At the same time, however, Thomas Hobart warns against the potential for conflict if reforms are sought without union involvement. He calls for a "buy-in by the whole faculty ... where parts of the contract may be put aside because they are preventative of what can bring about change in the school." He points to the problem of school programs that consist of teacher committees selected by the principal or superintendent, and notes that such

committees may make good decisions that can ultimately be blocked because the union was not made a part of the decision-making.

"For example," he says, "maybe the school day needs more time, and a committee in a given school comes to the decision after a lot of hard work to extend the school day by a half-hour, and that's announced by the principal at a faculty meeting. A faculty member stands up and says, 'But the collective bargaining agreement says I don't have to stay that half-hour.'" As a result, "we have a big confrontation, and now we have half of the faculty mad at the other half of the faculty, and nothing really comes of it.

"It might have been an excellent program, the one we needed in that school, but without union support at the beginning it couldn't have happened. If the union is brought in at the beginning, if the union buys into it, it becomes a union stake."

"Perhaps the most important lesson in the industrial area ... is the idea of borrowing the concept of worker ownership, giving people an opportunity to become worker owners but also the training to be able to assume that kind of responsibility. Where that took place, the individual workplaces were in fact more productive and there were specific benefits... ."

Stanley Litow
Executive Director
Interface

Can Industrial Models Apply in School Settings?

Many educators remain open to and even enthusiastic about adapting industrial practices to school settings. Much of what school theorists, researchers and practitioners know about their institutions is drawn from work produced outside the field of education by specialists in psychology, sociology, and history. Some educational administrators have been eager, perhaps even more eager than their industrial counterparts, to apply the scientific management strategies of Taylor or Mayo to the running of schools. Indeed, many universities maintain departments of school administration staffed by such educators. Early in this century, concepts of efficiency, economy, accountability, competency, and productivity were imported from business and formed the core of these departments. Personnel management divisions of the corporate and industrial world, however, began to turn away from these theories and techniques twenty years ago, and since then much of corporate America has redefined its management practice and moved away from the factory and assembly line models. They now see themselves as "people organizations, with the management of human resources as their most important activity." [17]

A large number of educators have yet to accept this definition of the corporation; they regard corporate models as unsuitable for educational institutions and agencies and view corporate ventures into education with some skepticism. Educational literature is full of dissenting opinion, diverse organizational designs, and sometimes rapturous descriptions of alternative educational modes that find their intellectual homes in humanistic, idealistic, or social democratic models.

"I think perhaps if private industry works with the parents ...If parents want to participate in open school during the day, they ought to make some sort of arrangement with the employer and the board member to be released to go to that kind of activity so that they're encouraging participation by parents. ... We need to have everyone involved in the decision-making process."

Charles Hughes
President
Local 372, AFSCME

In a deteriorating environment, with increasing social despair, these models may not prove to be practical [18] The American Society for Training and Development recently released a study of the skills employers are now seeking in their workers. The report indicates that skills formerly required of supervisors and managers such as "knowing how to learn," "problem-solving," "negotiation," and "leadership" have joined the "three R's." In addition, employers report that the most effective way to teach these skills is "to relate them directly to workers' jobs." [19]

Stanley Litow supports the application of industrial practices to schools and stresses the importance of recognizing that "changes in the workplace, whether it's the education workplace or the business workplace, require people to do different kinds of things—to assume different responsibilities." He also suggests an "early warning system" for the schools that would "identify what needs to be done ... to prevent the schools from falling below standards."

Business/Industry Contributions

While most schools welcome material gifts or the occasional visiting executive on loan, many become nervous when more extensive planning or joint policy shaping is proposed. The fully integrated school/business partnership remains rare in American education — it is usually little more than a pilot or demonstration project.

J. Richard Munro, Chief Executive Officer of Time, Inc., and education activist, argues that, as citizens of the nation, corporations have both a right and a duty to press for their philosophical and practical interests in educational institutions. He notes that his company had little hope that its involvement in the New York City schools would raise subscriptions or directly sell more books, but that concern for raising the general standard of living in the city was sufficient motivation. [20]

In keeping with this philosophy, the business leaders who signed the original Boston Compact announced in November 1988 that they would not renew their agreement "until the schools speed up the progress of reform....We are not ready to sign this new compact [until the schools] change the rules." In response, the president of the Boston School Committee accused the businessmen of "putting a gun to the school committee's head."[21]

Nearly two months later, the New York Times reported, "The decision by the business leaders, the Boston Private Industry Council, to delay renewing the compact has been interpreted by the public as casting a shadow on the concept of business-public

school cooperation." But at the same time, reported education editor Edward Fiske, "It can also be viewed as a sign that such relationships have moved beyond what one business leader called the 'feel good' stage and have run into some of the harsher realities of modern urban education." [22]

Accountability

While the search for effective measures of accountability often seems fruitless, some school systems are finding ways to support and implement methods that work.

Pittsburgh's schools, for example, are working with The Educational Testing Service and Howard Gardner's Project Zero team to develop methods for replacing standardized tests with broader measures of student ability to "pose interesting questions, devise novel solutions to problems, and create original works." [23] The Superintendent of Schools, Richard C. Wallace, Jr., intends to replicate the methods in all the middle and high schools of the system. In Vermont, the State Commissioner of Education has proposed "using a combination of test scores and folders of students' work to measure achievement in writing and mathematics." [24]

Newer work reviews a multitude of inputs and outcomes and uses new statistical techniques to hold the variables constant across measures. Individual students, groups of students, school organization, school district policy environment, the involvement of state or federal government agencies, the characteristics of their peers, the demographics of their home communities — these are all grist for the new methodology mill. [25] The data bases collected by psychologists, sociologists, ethnographers, historians, or economists can be analyzed and statistically related to standard school achievement data.

The perceptual data base may be expanded or contracted according to what is being examined. Students, teachers, parents, other professionals and outside agents are all encouraged to participate by providing and sharing perceptions and can even be asked to provide what E.G. Guba calls "member checks." [26] The accumulation of data, correlated, cross-referenced, and analyzed for validity takes us as close to the true measure of schooling reality as we can get.

Options for the State begin with widespread recognition of the need for accountability at the school level. Sandra Feldman stresses that "accountability needs to be measured from the bottom up. ...We do not need additional bureaucratic structures to ensure accountability...."

Describing a case in which the UFT helped teachers shed the burden of bureaucracy, Feldman recalls the first time funds

"[We need] an absolute recognition of the necessity for principals and supervisors to call the teachers in to ask the teachers 'Where are we failing? What can we do to improve? What courses of action do you suggest? What resources are necessary?' And then turn to Tom Sobol and say, 'By God, get some of these resources up.'"

Sol Chaikin
President Emeritus
I.L.G.W.U.

"I hope that some day we can guarantee that every child has an education in the New York City public schools because ultimately teachers are held accountable in the classroom and parents are being held accountable in the communities..."

Dr. Richard Green

were appropriated to cap class size in New York City: "The first year, the money disappeared; it didn't go where it was supposed to go." The following year, teachers took the responsibility of "exercising a monitoring system," and as a result, "the money was spent where it should have been... ."

Sol Chaiken urges the State "to involve the leader of the school and the cooperators — the teachers, the assistant principal" to set goals that are "higher than what exists today. Nobody knows that school better than the teachers who teach in that school and the principals who are supposed to be in that school."

In tackling new options for the State's approach to accountability, Commissioner Sobol maintains that "you can regulate out the worst abuses of the system ... but you can't regulate in goodness or excellence — because those qualities come right out of the hearts and minds of the people who are engaged in the day to day struggle in the classrooms. ... And you don't enlist people's minds and hearts and energies by telling them what to do from the top and how to do it."

The Commissioner believes that a far more effective approach to accountability is "for the State to exercise its right and discharge its duty to set standards —to set them very high — and to hold local jurisdictions accountable for the attainment of those standards, to provide support to the local jurisdictions to go about that ... but not to specify the means by which the local jurisdictions are going to achieve those outcomes."

V. PROPOSALS FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION

It is clear that not all private sector practices transfer to the educational arena. It is also clear that the education "revolution" of the 1980's needs specific supports from all the major constituencies if we are to realize even a fraction of our aims. The proposals below are starting points for the further discussion by government, education, business, and labor representatives that is essential to move the education reform movement ahead.

Participatory Decision-making

Agree on Terms

Disagreement about the definitions used in discussions of school restructuring, school reform, participatory decision-making, and other workplace issues could be addressed in State Education Department-sponsored conferences that bring the various constituencies together. Such conferences would not convert all participants to one approach or another, but additional public discussion may be needed if the agenda is to be shaped coherently.

Prepare for Change

Chief among reasons for the failure of participatory decision-making, local control of budget or policy shaping, or employee participation plans in those businesses and schools that choose these paths is the lack of preparation for the shaping of management roles and the more collaborative techniques needed for effective management. Teachers may want more responsibility for decision-making. This is a goal management may want to share. Yet without additional training and on-going support, the success rate of those trying to make the transition may be disappointing. A program to provide technical assistance to schools and school districts that choose these options might prove effective. The technique used by the ICC and others to support employee participation plans could be adapted to educational uses. For example, an "Educational Resource Team" (ERT) could train the trainers, identify consultants and specialists from industry and education, and create specific sequences of school staff development "crisis teams" that move into troubled situations quickly; serve as an "early warning system" that forecasts potential difficulties before they reach crisis status; spark "capacity building" activities for different types of staff members; do feasibility studies and problem analysis in specific

schools; create business/labor/government partnerships in specific communities; organize pilot "educational incubators" that allow and protect new or innovative approaches within traditional schools or districts; and be a "backup team" of successful educators that are available for short term assistance at the request of their colleagues. State Education Department staff could be assigned to assist the teams, and university/business/school partnerships could be encouraged to support the ERT's.

Learn from Success

State-sponsored conferences on shared decision-making for school board members, superintendents, principals, and teachers could be held to gather and evaluate information from other states and communities about the problems and the benefits of different approaches.

Keep Track of Reform

The State Education Department could establish and monitor pilot programs in school districts of different sizes and locations to gain more regional documentation of the effectiveness of these approaches to school management and organization. Perhaps the programs could be monitored through new regional "Centers for School Reform."

Regulation and Accountability

More Experiments

New York State could establish experimental sites to test more flexible approaches to school governance and regulation. The California Trust Agreement Project might be examined to determine its appropriateness for specific school districts in the State.

New Assessment Methods

The Commissioner and the State Education Department could support the use of multi-level and multi-modal assessment techniques for state-mandated programs. The additional funding required might be justified by the increased usefulness of data and the more accurate portraits of schooling and student achievement produced.

"Reform and improvement cost money ... and we probably will not be able to regularly get all we need. But we can't wait until the economy is vibrant enough to provide everything we need, because in the meantime we are losing too many kids along the way who, because they are the future of this state, must not be lost ... the business community needs them as workers, and our democracy needs educated voters."

Stanley Litow

Research and Development

New York State might profit from the establishment of a statewide policy research and analysis program such as that implemented through Policy Analysis for California Education (PACE). Though we have separate policy analysis agencies in New York State, the unique relationship between the universities, state education department, local school districts, and the Legislature that PACE created seems to allow for a more concerted effort than does our system. The PACE centers at Berkeley, Stanford, USC, and Sacramento are privately funded and unite the different sectors of California educational life in very practical program design efforts, as well as evaluation, policy briefings, conferences, technical assistance, testimony, policy drafting, and legislation development activities. A new center is not required for New York to move in this direction, but support for collaboration between existing agencies could prove to be extremely helpful. The Trust Agreement project described in the Appendix to this report is the result of the work of PACE and local school districts. It could not exist without both collaboration and non-partisan support.

Collective Bargaining

The efforts of such school districts as Rochester, Miami-Dade County, Cincinnati, and Pittsburgh could be studied more closely by other New York State districts. The UFT recently took New York City teachers to Florida to discuss the arrangements which have been made there with Miami-Dade school personnal. Further visits might be effective and school board members, principals, and superintendents could be involved in such sessions.

Administrator/Teacher Preparation

The pre-service education of teachers and school administrators could be examined and revised to include more information about workplace issues and practices. Teachers and school administrators could be provided with the skills required to join in collaborative decision-making.

One model of pre-service education that is being revised in New York State is the Teacher Corps. This model, tested nationally, incorporates extensive collaborative planning, decision-making, community engagement, university/business/school partnerships, and parent involvement. Expansion of this program,

which is designed primarily for minority teacher education students, could meet many of the design needs of pre-service education.

Staff Development Centers such as the proposed Educational Laboratory School or the Schenley Center in Pittsburgh could provide settings where staff might work together for extended periods of time to develop such skills as collaborative decision-making techniques. The standard one-time or very brief in-service staff development activities used by most school districts do not work. We know that follow-up, demonstration, and integration with the larger goals of the school are needed before staff development can be effective. Programs such as these might provide both the time and focus required to achieve the goals.

The future of the American economy, of our business and labor communities, is inextricably bound together with the future of American education. None of our efforts at economic development and competitiveness can ultimately succeed without an educated, skilled workforce. And the lessons and experiences that have led us to seek business-labor-government cooperation in the economic arena must also lead us toward increased cooperation, participation, and innovation in the education workplace.

Lewis Kaden
Chairman
Industrial Cooperation Council

CONCLUSION

As we have noted, the ultimate goal of education reform is to create more effective workplaces in our schools, and in so doing, to better educate our students. The means to achieve this goal are many, including supporting policy and program initiatives that test, monitor, and provide technical assistance to those schools and districts attempting to alter existing working situations.

Money remains an important focus. At the same time, the supports required for some potentially powerful reform activities are not especially costly. Clearly, there is the need for technical assistance — time, personnel, and materials. Some activities require regulatory or legislative change, while others require setting up centers, teams, or local citizen groups. The implementation of multi-level, multi-mode assessment techniques requires funding for additional researchers and evaluators. Lab Schools or Centers for School Reform will also require new funds for personnel. But, as a start, at least part of the funding for new ideas may be found in existing budgets.

What cannot be readily found are the attitudes and commitments needed to try these approaches in a concerted fashion. Colloquium participants expressed their willingness to seek new solutions, and thus there is reason to believe that effective restructuring efforts can be undertaken within this State's school system. Moreover, the ICC believes that some of the practices and organizational support mechanisms created for business and industry can be of use to educators and consideration should be given to their implementation as part of reform activities in New York State.

NOTES

1. Lanier and Featherstone, *Education Week*, 1988.

2. Robert Levering, A Great Place to Work—What Makes Some Employers So Good (And Most So Bad), (New York: Random House, 1988)

3. Deborah Meier, "Good Schools Are Still Possible, But Teachers Must Be Freed from System 'Mandates'," *Dissent*, (Fall 1987).

4. Arthur E. Wise, "Legislated Learning Revisited," *Phi Delta Kappan*, 69:5 (January 1988).

5. Arthur G. Wirth, Productive Work—In Industry and Schools: Becoming Persons—Again, (New York: University Press of America; 1983).

6. Gene I. Maeroff, "A Blueprint for Empowering Teachers," *Phi Delta Kappan*, 69:7 (March 1988).

7. Murray Schneider, "President's Message," *The Bulletin of Council of Administrators and Supervisors*, (September/October 1987).

8. Ann McLaughlin, *Education Week*, (October 12, 1988).

9. Arthur G. Wirth, The Violation of People at Work in Schools, (St. Louis, Missouri: Washington University).

10. John E. Chubb and Terry M. Moe, What Price Democracy? Politics, Markets and American Schools, Brookings Institution 1988.

11. Lynn Olson, "Work Conditions in Some Schools said 'Intolerable'," *Education Week*, (September 28, 1988).

12. David A. Nadler and Edward E. Lawler, III, Organizational Dynamics, (AMACOM periodical Division, American Management Associations; 1983).

13. Olson, op.cit.

14. Edmund J. McMahon Jr., "New York's Schools: Accountability is Easier Said Than Done," *Business New York*, (December 1988).

15. Thomas B. Corcoran, Lisa J. Walker, and J. Lynne White, Working in Urban Schools, (Washington, D.C., Institute for Educational Leadership, 1988).

16. Chubb and Moe, op.cit.

17. Denis P. Doyle and Marsha Levine, "Business and the Public Schools: Observations on the Policy Statement of the Committee for Economic Development," *Phi Delta Kappan*, (October 1985).

18. Arthur G. Wirth, "Quality of Life in Work and School Vis-a-vis Investing in Our Children: Business and the Public Schools." *Educational Theory*, 38:1 (Winter 1988).

19. "Fortune Calls on Business to Help Schools," *Education Week*, (November 9, 1988).

20. J. Richard Munro, "Business and Education: Toward a New Partnership," *Education and Society*, 1:3 (Fall 1988).

21. Ibid.

22. Edward B. Fiske, "Business Leaders Strike a Deal with Educators and Now They Press Some Demands," *The New York Times*, (Dec. 21, 1988), B8.

23. Lynn Olson, "Toledo's New 'Stipends' for Principals Turn Playgrounds into Battlegrounds," *Education Week*, (November16, 1988).

24. Ibid.

25. Robert Dreeben and J. Alan Thomas, eds., The Analysis of Educational Productivity, (Cambridge, MA: Ballinger Publishing Company; 1980).

26. E.G. Guba, "Criteria for Assessing the Trustworthiness of Naturalistic Inquiries," *Educational Communications and Technology Journal*, 29:2 (1981).

APPENDIX: CASE STUDIES

CASE 1

TEACHER LABORATORY SCHOOL: NYC STAFF DEVELOPMENT MODEL

Interface, a public policy group in New York City long involved in education, recommended that the New York City school system establish a Laboratory School for teachers based on the design of Pittsburgh's Schenley Center. In this school, specially trained mentors would provide new teachers with six to eight weeks of concentrated staff training and clinical experience. Among the laboratory school's purposes were:

- **Provide** teachers with in-service instruction, including the three days of staff development required of new teachers during their first school year and the three days required during their second summer;
- **Provide** a formal setting for mandated staff development in specific topics, such as child abuse, AIDS, Family Life/Sex Education, and multi-cultural curricula;
- **Provide** uniform instruction for teachers, especially in counseling and guidance-related techniques, on teaching Limited English Proficiency (LEP) students, special education students, those recently mainstreamed, and children in temporary housing;
- **Help** revitalize hard-to-staff schools by providing a magnet to attract experienced and enthusiastic teachers to areas that have suffered high turnover;
- **Provide** laboratory experiences in shared or participatory-decision-making for teachers and supervisors.

The school was designed to work on eight-week cycles, with six weeks set aside for intern teachers to work with clinical resident teachers at the lab school and a few days on either end of this period for the replacement teacher and intern to work together to acclimate students to staff changes. During the remaining days of the eight-week cycle, replacement teachers would be encouraged to work on developing their own curricula or other independent academic projects.

The replacement teachers were the linchpin of the lab school concept. They would provide the class with specialized enrichment instruction while the regular teacher is away. Only a few eligible teachers from a given school would attend the lab school at one time.

CASE 2

THE TRUST AGREEMENT PROJECT

The California Trust Agreement Project is designed "1) to develop new forms of school organization and new patterns of relationships among teachers and school administrators, and 2) to expand the range of labor-management discussions in education from the technical, procedural work rules that are the traditional purview of collective bargaining to substantive areas of education policy."

Six school districts joined in a collaborative effort with the California Federation of Teachers, the School Boards Association, and Policy Analysis for

California Education (PACE). Each district focused on an area of policy that was important locally: three chose peer assistance and review; one chose staff development; another picked staff evaluation; and one chose two areas: career development for paraprofessionals and elementary school interdisciplinary literature-based reading.

The Trust Agreement Project grew out of a consensus that traditional contract negotiations are not effective or efficient ways to effect reform or innovation and that more flexible and adaptable agreements are needed for diverse educational situations.

Tentative definitions and conclusions have been derived from the project. A trust agreement is currently defined as a "negotiated compact" in which teachers and administrators address specific educational problems and define a process for resolving them. The agreement must contain specific components: "1) a purpose statement which delineates the parties to the agreement, the agreement's goals, and the scope of the undertaking; 2) identification of resources to be deployed, including money, time, personnel, and authority; 3) implementation clauses which delineate program structure and assign responsibility for executing the agreement; and 4) a mechanism for resolving disputes that might arise under the terms of the agreement."

The designers of this project see trust agreements as "the missing link between collective bargaining and professionalizing teaching." They do not replace collective bargaining, which the designers view as focused on the lives of individuals, but they enhance the process by facilitating decisions about the organization. The PACE researchers reached seven tentative conclusions from the first year of their work:

1. Trust agreement discussions are substantively different from contract negotiations.
2. Strong union and district leadership are necessary components of trust agreement success.
3. Determining the policy area for trust agreement work is not nearly as thorny as developing a successful process by which to reach agreement.
4. The definition of a trust agreement is dependent on the school district context.
5. Developing a network among participating districts is an essential element of the program.
6. Trust agreements may not be prerequisites to reform, but they serve as catalysts to speed change.
7. Trust agreements produce role changes.

The Trust Agreement consciously sets out to provide greater involvement for the school board, a group that is often left out of reform literature and new organizational practices.

CASE 3

BASIC SCHOOL STAFFING PROGRAM: NYC LOCAL CONTROL OF STAFFING

The New York City Board of Education received $20 million from the City Council and the Board of Estimate in 1987-88 to expand direct instructional support services in every elementary, intermediate and junior high school in the city. The money was to be used to hire additional subject matter specialists, and

library, guidance, attendance and training and supervisory staff for the separate schools. The goal was to raise the staffing ratios in the city to those prevailing elsewhere in the State.

The unique aspects of this program are its flexible approach to spending the funds and its insistence on participatory decision-making involving the entire school community, including parents, teachers and supervisors. There are guidelines and categories that must be adhered to, such as: a limit of no more than 15% to be spent on supervisory personnel, library and guidance services should be priorities, and funds must be used to supplement existing programs. But the narrow categories normally found in New York City personnel policy are removed. No plan can be approved without parental approval. In the first year of the program there was insufficient time for consultation and collaboration. As Chancellor Green reported, "Resources divorced from school-based consultation and planning do not produce improved schools." The coordination plan for the second year of the project requires that district-level parent, UFT and CSA (Counselors, Supervisors and Administrators) representatives participate in the decision-making process. Existing school-based planning committees may be used when appropriate.

CASE 4

SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT: MIAMI-DADE COUNTY

With more than 260 schools and 250,000 students, the Miami-Dade school district is the fourth largest in the country. Given its size, one might expect the district to be mired in bureaucracy and slow to adopt school changes or improvements. Yet Miami-Dade has one of the most progressive school systems in the country.

The most important new program in Miami-Dade is School-Based Management/Shared Decision-Making (SBM/SDM), an experiment in educational management in which teachers and administrators assume responsibility for the management of their schools. Developed jointly by the school administration and the leadership of the teachers union at the end of 1986 contract talks, the program invited all of the county's schools to present a program for improving the quality of education, teachers, and staffing. In managing their own schools, moreover, teachers and administrators would be given greater flexibility and would receive an ongoing evaluation of the program. Of the 55 three-year proposals that were submitted, 33 were accepted.

The 1986 contract talks not only laid the groundwork for SBM/SDM. According to Miami-Dade Superintendent Joseph Fernandez, they also helped move the district towards achieving the "professionalization of teaching."

Both the concept of professionalization and the program of school-based management were expanded upon in the 1988 contract. The new three-year agreement between the teachers and school board has been hailed as a landmark contract. According to the agreement, teachers receive the following:

- **Higher Salaries.** Teachers now get an average salary of $30,000, which is somewhat above the national average. That figure will go up roughly 10% each year for the next three years. Some teachers, in fact, will be able to earn up to $64,000 a year, making them among the highest paid teachers in the nation.
- Increased input in hiring and evaluating principals, assistant principals, and supervisors. In addition, in 49 pilot schools, teachers will now evaluate school leaders.

- **Better work environment.** Most of the revenue from a $980 million bond issue will go towards improving classrooms and designing new classrooms and schools.

- **More opportunities for growth and development.** A "professional leave bank" allows teachers to take several days off to attend mini-courses or education conferences to broaden their horizons and stay on the "cutting edge" of education. The district also plans to develop a career ladder during the 1988-89 school year which will be somewhat similar to the one in Rochester.

- **Expansion of the school-based management program.** At present, 45 schools are participating in the program, and Superintendent Fernandez estimates that about 45 more will volunteer within the next year.

Other provisions of the contract are designed to make teachers and principals more responsive to parents and community members. Teachers will distribute report cards twice as frequently as before, and will devote two nights a year to meeting with parents to discuss their student's progress. In addition, a joint committee of teachers and school officials is considering implementing a "community report card" that parents and community members can use to evaluate their local school's performance.

Much of the success of the 1988 talks can be credited to favorable labor relations between the United Teachers of Dade and the Dade County Public Schools. According to Pat Tornillo, president of the teachers union, over half of the proposals discussed in the talks had been developed jointly by management and teachers.

CASE 5

A NEW STYLE OF LABOR NEGOTIATIONS: ROCHESTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT

In June 1987, the Rochester Teachers Association (RTA) and the Rochester City School District (RCSD) negotiated a three-year contract with an explicit agenda for educational reform. The two parties recognized the need for both experimentation in instructional programs and techniques and "school based planning," which includes teacher representation on the planning committees. The contract is intended to offer career options to teachers: without requiring that they leave the classroom, they can assume greater responsibility in shaping and improving student attainment and performance.

As part of the Agreement, the RTA President and the Superintendent of Schools established the Career in Teaching Plan. All Rochester City School District teachers participate in the Plan, which provides four distinct stages in career development: Intern, Resident, Professional and Lead Teacher.

Assignment to the first three stages of the Career in Teaching Plan is based on teacher certification, tenure and experience in teaching. For example, newly hired teachers without New York State teaching experience work as Interns for their first year in the District. After successful completion of their internship, they serve as Residents until they have received both permanent New York State certification and tenure in the District.

Permanently certified, tenured teachers in the District become Professional Teachers. Professional Teacher status is a pre-requisite for applying for the new Lead Teacher position — the top of the career ladder. Lead Teachers serve as adjunct faculty at schools of education and also act as curriculum development/implementation specialists, staff development specialists and demonstration teachers.

In addition to serving as mentors to other teachers, Lead Teachers are required to spend 50% of their time in the classroom. Moreover, under the plan, the most difficult students are not assigned to teachers with the least seniority, as is the practice in many school districts. Instead, these classes are assigned to the Lead Teachers. Lead Teachers are chosen by a Joint Governing Panel comprised of five members appointed by the RTA and five members appointed by the Superintendent of Schools. Lead Teacher salaries are in the area of $68,900 per year.

Rochester's Career in Teaching plan establishes a method for developing and maintaining a corps of the highest caliber teachers in the RCSD by providing an opportunity for exemplary teachers to share their knowledge and expertise with others, and to actively participate in instructional decision-making while remaining in the classroom part of the time.

A second part of the Agreement between the RTA and RCSD calls for "School Based Planning" to be carried out by planning teams of principals, teachers, parents, students and a number of others chosen by the team's members. School-Based Planning is based on the principle that the productivity of schools is critically dependent upon the degree to which members of the school community, especially teachers, understand and share in the District's goals and the development of programs to achieve those goals. The School-Based Planning teams meet regularly throughout the year in their efforts to achieve their goals for school improvement.

CASE 6

PARTICIPATIVE DECISION-MAKING: CINCINNATI PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Given Cincinnati's history of formalized, adversarial labor relations, it is not surprising that a strained relationship between the Cincinnati Federation of Teachers (CFT) and the central administration had existed prior to 1983. What has ensued since then has been remarkable. Teachers have become actively involved in education reform, and exchanges between Cincinnati teachers and the school board have emerged as collaborative and non-adversarial.

Cincinnati public school teachers' main points of contention were having little input into policy changes and school improvements, and having principals undermine their authority—often "changing students' grades or promoting students who had failed most of their coursework." The central administration, moreover, had long been opposed to empowering teachers, preferring instead to use top-down initiatives to improve the quality of education.

In 1983, two years before contract renegotiations, CFT President Thomas Mooney sought public support for the union by downplaying teacher demands for higher pay and better working conditions, and focusing instead on suggestions that would improve the quality of education. The press took up the union's case, endorsing its proposals and publicizing its positions. The school board, however, was put off by the union's aggressive play for public support.

The CFT sought five main changes: 1) limiting class size to 25; 2) implementing a peer-appraisal program; 3) moving the authority to make all appointments of teachers to city committees; 4) prohibiting principals from

changing student grades, and 5) implementing higher standards for significant raises for senior teachers and 12% annual increases for two years for other teachers.

Ultimately, albeit reluctantly, the School Board met most of the union's demands. Although both parties had initially agreed to adopt a peer-assistance program to guard against principals' changing students' course grades, it took the threat of a strike by the CFT and intense discussions by CFT President Mooney and Lynn Goodwin, of the school district central administration, to reach a final settlement. Teachers won large salary increases, limits on class size, the authority to appoint all teachers to joint committees, and a two-year test of the school appraisal plan. The principals (and to a lesser extent, the school board) were seen as losing some of their authority and power.

Although some were dissatisfied with the outcome, all worked hard to ensure the contract's success. A teacher allocation program (which assigned extra teachers to highly populated schools) and the peer assistance program were hailed as successes. Principals extended the latter program to assist experienced as well as novice teachers, and the programs established more stringent criteria for evaluating the beginning teachers, effectively clearing teachers' ranks, as many principals had been unwilling or unable to do.

In the 1986-87 school year, the CFT broadened its scope beyond the new contract, pushing for a new core curriculum in all high schools in the district (largely to improve test scores), urging that more attention be focused on improving underachieving elementary schools, and arguing for still more teacher involvement in policy and planning. The union's ambitious agenda won the support of the new School Superintendent, Lee Etta Powell, who recommended that the school improvement plan be tested at two kindergarten facilities.

The implementation of the school improvement plan represented a critical juncture in the education reform movement in Cincinnati. Initially, confusion abounded. The teaching staff had great difficulty making routine decisions and was unclear as to how to develop programs that would improve the students' education. In light of the slow-moving experiment and the high cost of other CFT-proposed programs (which necessitated additional funding), many were openly critical of teacher involvement in policy-making: Did they actually have the solutions to problems that had plagued administrators and school boards for years, or were these nothing more than expensive proposals? Would teachers continue to collaborate with the school board, or try to ride roughshod over them? Was this so-called "collaborative approach" actually working?

While it is still too early to fairly evaluate the success of the collaborative, teacher-involved programs in Cincinnati, both the CFT and the central office reaffirmed their commitment to the efforts of Mooney and Goodwin, who stressed the betterment of education and not salary demands, and to Conflict Management, Inc., a cooperative problem-solving consultant firm chosen to train both sides in exploring alternative solutions in a non-combative manner. The two sides were able to work out an agreement in which both "won." By rearranging high school schedules, they were able to both increase instructional time for students and decrease teacher workload. They established a career-in-teaching program with four steps leading to Lead Teacher status and agreed to seek funding for pre-school education. Most important, they concentrated their efforts on developing a system in which the students could be winners as well.

COLLOQUIUM PARTICIPANTS

TERRY BAKER
Associate Dean of Education, Hofstra University

ALLAN BLANKSTEIN
President, National Education Service

JEFF BOWEN
Research & Development Administrator, New York State School Boards Association

SOL CHAIKIN
President Emeritus, International Ladies Garment Workers Union

SANDRA FELDMAN
President, United Federation of Teachers

THOMAS GILLETT
Vice President & Chief Negotiator, Rochester Teachers Association

RICHARD GREEN
Chancellor, New York City School System

LOUIS GRUMET
Executive Secretary, New York State School Boards Association

STANLEY HILL
Executive Director, District Council 37, AFSCME

THOMAS HOBART
President, New York State United Teachers

CHARLES HUGHES
President, Local 372, New York City Board of Education Employees, AFSCME

RONALD JONES
Special Representative for Educational Programs, United Federation of Teachers

LEWIS B. KADEN
Chairman, New York State Industrial Cooperation Council

PETER LAZES
Director, P.E.W.S., Cornell University

STANLEY LITOW
Executive Director, Interface

ROBERT LONGLEY
Senior Vice President for Community Relations, Morgan Guaranty Bank

LAWRENCE MANDELL
Deputy Executive Director, United Way

DOUGLES MARCHANT
Industrial Relations Specialist, U.S. Department of Labor

JEWELL JACKSON McCABE
Chairperson, New York State Job Training Partnership Council

EDWARD MORTOLA
Chancellor, Pace University

PHILIP RIVERA
Office of Corporate Affairs, Chancellor's Office, NYC Board of Education

THOMAS RYAN
Executive Director of Human Resources, New York City Board of Education

CHARLES SANTELLI
Director of Research & Educational Services, New York State United Teachers

MARIAN SCHWARTZ
Coordinator for Youth Service, Office of the Mayor, City of New York

RON SHELP
President & C.E.O., New York City Partnership

HILDY SIMMONS
Vice President for Community Relations, J.P. Morgan Co.

THOMAS SOBOL
Commissioner of Education, State of New York

JAMES R. TALLON JR.
Majority Leader, New York State Assembly

VINCENT TESE
Director of Economic Development, State of New York

THOMAS VAN ARSDALE
President, New York City Central Labor Council

NEW YORK STATE INDUSTRIAL COOPERATION COUNCIL

The New York State Industrial Cooperation Council (ICC) was established by Governor Mario Cuomo to analyze major economic issues facing New York State and the Nation, to implement innovative programs and ideas, and to foster cooperation among business, labor, and government. The Council includes leaders of major New York industries, labor organizations, and public representatives familiar with the changing needs and problems of the State's economy. The ICC is supported by a full-time staff under Executive Director Lee Smith. The Chairman of the ICC is Lewis B. Kaden, a partner in the law firm of Davis Polk & Wardwell.

PROJECTS

The Cuomo Commission on Trade and Competitiveness brings together leading figures in business, labor, government and academia to address the problems of the U.S. trade deficit and American competitiveness.

The Task Force on Pension Investment was appointed by the Governor in November, 1988, to examine the role of public and private pension funds in corporate governance, whether the State's Common Retirement Fund should have a Board of Trustees, and to suggest ways to increase pension fund investment in economic development.

PROGRAMS

Promote Employee Ownership and Participation: The ICC assists employees, managers and current owners interested in employee ownership and participation. Through its Center for Employee Ownership and ParticiPation, the ICC helps them assess the feasibility of employee ownership, arrange financing, provides technical assistance and training to both employees and management during the transition process, and helps companies and unions develop employee participation programs, including training in new forms of workplace organization.

Help Dislocated Workers: One of the ICC's first accomplishments was the negotiation of the New York COMPACT, an innovative agreement among business, labor and government to retain industry in New York State, provide advance notice of plant closings, and ease the impact of economic dislocation.

Reform Education: The ICC's Education Sub-Committee explores ways to improve public education by changing traditional labor-management relations in the schools.

CONFERENCES

Global Leadership for the 1990s, The Roles of the United States, Japan and Europe, June 8, 1989, New York City, presented by Japan Society and the ICC.

Working in the Schools, A Colloquium on Labor-Management Relations in Education, December 9, 1988, New York City.

Innovation Through Cooperation, A Symposium on the Future of Business-Labor-Government Relations, November 18-19, 1987, New York City.

PUBLICATIONS

Employees Take the Wheel: A Study of Employee Ownership at Avis, Inc., July 1989.

Our Money's Worth, The Report of the Governor's Task Force on Pension Fund Investment, June 1989.

A Fighting Chance: New Strategies to Save Jobs and Reduce Costs, (Ithaca: ILR Press), December 1988.

The Cuomo Commission Report: A New American Formula for a Strong Economy, (New York: Touchstone/Simon & Schuster), June 1988.

America's Steel Industry: A Time To Act, October 1988.

New York Can Compete: A Survey of Successful Exporting Firms in New York State, April 1988.

Getting a Piece of the Action: A Survey of Employee-Owned Firms in New York State, October 1987.

New York is Working This Labor Day: New Data on Business and Labor Growth in New York State (includes comparative data for 10 other states), August 1987.

Impact of the National Trade Deficit on New York State Employment, June 1987.

FOR MORE INFORMATION ON THE I.C.C. AND ITS PROGRAMS
PLEASE CONTACT

LEE SMITH
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
NEW YORK STATE INDUSTRIAL COOPERATION COUNCIL
1515 BROADWAY, 52nd FLOOR
NEW YORK, NY 10036
(212) 930-0093
FAX (212) 930-0100